



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Gibbon are superseded. But the investigator may find consolation in the thought that though his own work dies and Truth is relative, he hands on the torch—of method.

Apollo is neither the heavenly fiddler of Raphael, nor the sun, nor can his essential character be derived from the life of nature. We can only see that he is a non-Hellenic eastern divinity at first conceived by the Greeks as a power of evil to be propitiated. Leto exists in Greece only as coming in his train. His sanctuaries, under his name, Delos, Ptoion, Delphi are comparatively late. At Delphi in the interval from Hesiod to Pindar the Apolline religion glorified by Otfried Müller, Curtius (and Matthew Arnold) was developed. It is the religion of Pindar and of Sophocles, but not of the other great Athenians nor of Homer. It is the religion of conservative and Dorian Hellas, the religion of *γνώθι σαυτόν* and *σωφροσύνη* and *εἰνομία*, but not of ecstasy, hope, progress, and democracy. The Athenians must needs transcend it, and to Euripides it was an abomination. But we, after our science has endeavored to trace the many and diverse Apollos of local cult and legend, may and must revive in our hearts and realize in our lives the Apolline religion of Pindar and Sophocles.

It is perhaps pedantry to cavil on a detail amid so much truth and suggestiveness. But would Professor Wilamowitz unless *θέσει διαφυλάττων* seriously maintain that Apollo's originally destructive character is proved by Achilles addressing him as "most deadly of the gods?" Achilles' words are (*Il.* xxii. 15) *ἔβλαψας μ' ἐκάεργε θεῶν ὀλοώτατε πάντων*—"thou hast balked me far-darter, most mischievous of the gods." Obviously this is a mere example of the petulant irreverent familiarity on which Ruskin comments so amusingly. Menelaus says the same of Zeus in *Il.* iii. 365, and Asius in *Il.* xii. 164 calls Zeus *φιλοψευδής* because of the disappointment of his own expectations. Similarly it may be doubted whether the description of the gods rising up in fear at the approach of Apollo in the beginning of the Delian Hymn is much more than a slight exaggeration of the honorific motive of *Il.* xv. 85 where the gods rise up to do reverence to Hera.

PAUL SHOREY

Briefwechsel zwischen August Böckh und Ludolph Dissen, Pindar und Anderes betreffend. Herausgegeben von MAX HOFFMANN. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. 233. M. 5.

This book possesses considerable value for the student of Pindar, but it is particularly interesting for the picture it gives of the golden age of German classical scholarship—the age of Böckh and Hermann and Welcker. The letters of Dissen in the collection far outnumber those of

Böckh, and present a most engaging view of the Göttingen professor's character, with his modest estimate of his own powers, and his profound and affectionate admiration for his friend. "Wenn ich einen Brief von Ihnen erhalte," he writes, "dann mache ich erst allemal eine Pfeife an, und recht wie zu einem herrlichen Genuss setze ich mich dann zurecht, Ihren Brief zu lesen." The affection of Böckh for Dissen seems no less genuine, but it is expressed with more reserve, as comports with the Olympian nature of the man. So, too, though Gottfried Hermann and his school are the *bête noire* of both the friends, yet here, as well, Böckh is calmer and more moderate in his expressions of antipathy. Dissen's life-long struggle with ill-health, leading to his premature death at the age of fifty-three, lends a pathetic interest to his letters. One is at times painfully reminded of the correspondence between Erwin Rohde and Friedrich Nietzsche, in which the declining health of the latter is sadly mirrored in the gradual exchange of attitude, by which Rohde becomes the adviser and oracle, in place of his more brilliant friend. We learn, too, to estimate more correctly the relative importance of the contributions of Böckh and Dissen, respectively, to the great Pindar commentary. In difficult questions, the decision usually rests with the sounder judgment and wider range of Böckh, but insight, originality, and penetration into the poet's inner meaning, are often on the side of Dissen. Throughout the book, the reader feels the new impulse that was stirring among German scholars, during the early part of the last century. The spectacle of two young men, both much under 30 years of age, addressing themselves confidently (and successfully) to the difficult task of laying a new foundation for the Pindaric study of the future, in face of the recent and much-admired work of Heyne and Hermann, is one of the most inspiring in the history of classical philology. The detailed discussion of Pindar, in these letters, began in 1819, and continued till 1830. Dissen then published his independent edition "des göttlichen Dichters," and was deeply wounded by Böckh's coolness (as he felt) in reviewing the new book. The wound was healed through the good offices of K. O. Müller, but the correspondence never again became so active as before.

The thoroughness with which the two joint-editors debated the interpretation of difficult passages may be illustrated by their treatment of *N.* 7. 77 ff., where the Muse is asked to prepare for Sogenes a garland of gold, ivory, and coral. Dissen must satisfy himself as to the precise form and structure of the garland, as the poet conceived it. In his first draft of the commentary, he suggests that the ivory was used for the leaves of the wreath, but in the note which accompanied his MS (October 27, 1820), after citing the words of a letter from Welcker ("aus denen ich nicht viel machen kann") he admits that he is uncertain as to the ivory leaves, and would prefer to think of the whole garland as made of gold, with ivory inlaid, if he could only satisfy himself as to how this was done. Böckh

replies (November 11) that he, too, doubts the white leaves. He agrees that gold was the chief material used, with perhaps berries of coral, and flowers of composite structure. He deprecates, however, too close an inquiry into the nature of the wreath, and thinks that the precious materials may indicate only the unusual value and permanence of the gift. On November 22, Dissen accepts most of what Böckh has suggested, but prefers to set his friend's contribution *after* his own, "weil man doch das beste nicht zuerst sondern zuletzt aufischt." In the following April Dissen again refers to Welcker's views, but adds "die Antiquare haben freilich eine eigene Fertigkeit allerlei zu combiniren, was am Ende keinen sicheren Halt hat." Finally (September 26, 1821) he notes the fact that Sogenes was the *first* Aeginetan to win the Nemean Pentathlon, as proving that Böckh was entirely right in his explanation of the materials as symbolic. He now prefers to rest the whole interpretation solely on Böckh's authority, and "will keine symboliker und Archäologen weiter zu Hülfe rufen. Denn ich habe immer schon Angst gehabt dass dieses Volk viel Spuk mit der Stelle treiben werde, nach dem die Sache in Anregung gekommen, obgleich früher sie alle darüber hinweggegangen sind, als wenn gar nichts zu erklären wäre." The explanation of the garland finally appeared, both in Böckh's edition of 1821, and in Dissen's of 1830, in a form combining the views of both scholars. Fennell, Christ, and Schroeder ignore the whole question!

The book is provided with sufficient indexes, and the editor has contributed copious notes, explaining the persons and events referred to in the text. A brief sketch of the lives of the two scholars should have been added, sparing the reader a reference to the editor's previous life of Böckh (1901), or to Pökel.

EDWARD B. CLAPP

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Athenian Family. A Sociological and Legal Study, Based Chiefly on the Works of Attic Orators. By CHARLES ALBERT SAVAGE. Baltimore, 1907. Pp. 137.

This monograph, which is described by the author as a "dissertation, wide in its scope and somewhat general in its character," contains chapters on: "Religious Feeling in Athenian Private Life," "The Attitude of the State toward the Family," "The Position of Women during the Period of the Attic Orators," "Marriage," "Parents and Children," "Adoption and Leading Aspects of the Athenian Inheritance System." These are large subjects to be treated adequately in one hundred and thirty-seven pages. Professor Savage justly anticipates criticism of his incomplete bibliography. Probably the most serious omission is Beauchet's *Histoire du droit privé de la république athénienne*, which